

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated December 15, 2005, claims 85-86, 88-89, 93, 95-97, and 100-112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 84-86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Strauss. Claims 88-92, 101-105, 111-112, 118, 122-128, 132, 136-141, 145, 149-150, 154-160, and 164-171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Applicants' disclosure. Claims 129-131, 142-144, 161-163, and 172-174 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosure. Claims 55-61, 68, 78-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss in view of Uschold. Claims 93, 95-96, 106-109, 119, 133, 146, and 151 were rejected over Applicants' disclosure in view of Japanese Patent No. 195646. Claims 97-100 and 109-110 were rejected over Applicants' disclosure in view of Strauss.

Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 71, 88-94, 118-120, 132-134, 145-147, and 150-152 will have been amended, claims 1-70, 72-87, 95, 97-117, 121-131, 135-144, 148-149, and 153-180 will have been canceled, and claims 71, 88-94, 96, 118-120, 132-134, 145-147, 150-152, and 181-189 will remain pending in the application. No claims filed in the Amendment filed February 6, 2006 have been examined.

Although currently pending claims 71, 94, 120, 134, 147, and 152 have been withdrawn by the Examiner as non-elected under a Specie requirement, these claims have been amended by the present amendment to address elected claim language alleged by the Examiner to be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

RESPONSE

Interview Summary

The Examiner issued an Interview Summary with a mailing date of March 17, 2006 responsive to a telephone interview dated March 14, 2006. The Interview Summary indicates the Examiner's agreement that the value 0.044 is not within the claimed range of "0.04 or less." This agreement by the Examiner essentially renders moot the rejections based upon the value 0.044 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 in the Office Action dated December 15, 2005. However, in response to the rejections asserted in the Office Action dated December 15, 2005, Applicants filed an Amendment on February 6, 2006. These claims have not been examined in any manner. Since the rejections asserted in the Office Action dated December 15, 2005 were improper, Applicants hereby submit the present Amendment responsive both to the Office Action dated December 15, 2005 and the Interview Summary dated March 17, 2006. Also, in response to a request by the Examiner during the telephone interview of March 14, 2006, Applicants have reduced the number of claims pending in the present application. Applicants request entry and consideration of the present Amendment.

Election/Restrictions:

As acknowledged previously, the Examiner's amended specie requirement appears consistent with the requirement imposed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 85-86, 88-89, 93, 95-97, and 100-112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claims 85-86, 95, 97, and 100-112 have been canceled by the present Amendment, rendering the rejections applied thereto moot. Claims 88-89 and 93 have been amended herein and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections is requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 84-86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Strauss. Claims 88-92, 101-105, 111-112, 118, 122-128, 132, 136-141, 145, 149-150, 154-160, and 164-171 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Applicants' disclosure. Applicants traverse these rejections.

Since claims 84-86 have been canceled, the rejections based on Strauss are moot.

In view of the Interview Summary mailed March 17, 2006, the rejections applied under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on Applicant's disclosure are improper, should not have been applied initially, and should be withdrawn as moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 129-131, 142-144, 161-163, and 172-174 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosure. Claims 55-61, 68, 78-80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss in view of Uschold. Claims 93, 95-96, 106-109, 119, 133, 146, and 151 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosure in view of Japanese patent No. 195646. Claims 97-100 and 109-110 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' disclosure in view of Strauss. Applicants traverse these rejections.

In view of the Interview Summary mailed March 17, 2006, the rejections applied under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Applicants' disclosure are improper, should not have been applied

initially, and should be withdrawn as moot. All rejected dependent claims are allowable as inheriting the subject matter of the independent claims upon which they depend. The prior art fails to teach or show insect screening as claimed and fails to provide a teaching or suggestion to modify or combine any prior art to reach the claims. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Reincorporation of Nonelected Claims:

Independent claims 88, 118, 132, 145, and 150 are allowable. Claims 1-70, 72-87, 95, 97-117, 121-131, 135-144, 148-149, and 153-180 have been canceled. Elected claims 88-93, 96, 118-119, 132-133, 145-146, 151, and 181-189 each depend upon allowable independent claims 88, 118, 132, 145, or 150 and are likewise allowable as inheriting the allowable subject matter thereof. Further, non-elected claims 71, 94, 120, 134, 147, and 152 should be reincorporated into the application and allowed since they inherit the allowable subject matter of the independent claims from which they depend. Accordingly, all pending claims 71, 88-94, 96, 118-120, 132-134, 145-147, 150-152, and 181-189 are in allowable form and should be allowed.

CONCLUSION


The application is in condition for allowance and an early notice of allowance is requested. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' counsel at the telephone number specified below with any questions or comments regarding this application.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0528.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/13/06


Keats A. Quinalty
Reg. No. 46,426
Attorney for Applicants

Customer No. 26158
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
Telephone: (404) 879-2423
Facsimile: (404) 879-2923

Docket No. A202 1441.2